

REMARKS

Reconsideration is requested for claims 1-21.

The drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). It was asserted that the drawings do not show the claim limitation that "each tooth having a single winding". Fig. 4 was previously added to show this subject matter which formed part of the original disclosure and it was understood that this objection had been withdrawn. If Fig. 4 is now considered to be inadequate, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner provide further explanation for this position. Withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is cordially urged.

Claims 1-3, 9-12, and 19-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,229,689 to *Nickoladz* and U.S. Patent No. 5,652,493 to *Hendershot* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,031,304 to *Suzuki et al.* Claims 4 and 13-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nickoladz* in view of *Hendershot* and *Suzuki et al.* and JP 406245456A (*Taguchi*) Claims 8, 17, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nickoladz* in view of *Hendershot* and *Suzuki et al.* and U.S. Patent No. 5,763,978 to *Uchida et al.* Claims 5-7 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nickoladz*, *Hendershot*, *Suzuki et al.*, and *Taguchi* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,049,153 to *Nishiyama et al.*

Except for the newly cited *Nickoladz* patent, the other patents have been cited and discussed. *Nickoladz* is understood to be cited as disclosing a stator for an electrical

induction machine having an even number of stator sections 11, 12 at different axial locations, each section having a plurality of teeth and each tool having a single winding. It is acknowledged that *Nickoladz* does not disclose that the stator sections may be “physically shifted related to skew”. It is presumed that the reference to the stator sections not being “physically shifted related to skew” is a typographical error as the claims recite that the stator sections are physically shifted relative to one another in a circumferential direction by $360^\circ/n \pm \text{an angle related to skew}$.

There are other differences between the claimed invention and *Nickoladz*. For example, the claims recite that power is supplied for the teeth of a first set of the $n/2$ stator sections and for the teeth of the second set of the $n/2$ stator sections. In *Nickoladz*, power is supplied to the excitor stage 11 by the source E, but power is drawn from the generator stage 12 by the load L. The two stages 11 and 12 are not properly described as being sections of a stator in the sense used in the claims. The stages 11 and 12 are separate stators.

Additionally, there is nothing in *Nickoladz* that is understood to correspond to the recitation in the claims that the stator sections are physically shifted relative to one another in a circumferential direction by $360^\circ/n \pm \text{an angle related to skew}$.

Hendershot is cited as disclosing that an electrical machine has two stator sections 2, 10 that are mutually phase shifted. It is acknowledged that *Hendershot* does not disclose that the stator sections are shifted by 180° , i.e., that the stator sections are physically

shifted relative to one another in a circumferential direction by $360^\circ/n \pm$ an angle related to skew

Suzuki is cited as disclosing stator sections 5a, 5b that are phase shifted by 180° .

As discussed in more detail in the Amendment originally filed February 27, 2003, and entered upon filing an RCE, *Suzuki* does not disclose that power supplied for the teeth of a first set of $n/2$ stator sections is shifted 180° electrical relative to power supplied for the teeth of a second set of $n/2$ of the stator sections as recited in claims 1 and 11.

There are numerous other differences between the claimed invention and *Hendershot* and *Suzuki* that have been discussed elsewhere.

From Paragraph 7 of the Official Action it appears the Examiner considers that the claims could cover stators wherein there are 16 stator sections such that the shift between sections is 22.5° as shown for the *two* stators of *Hendershot*. While the claims will certainly cover structures with 16 stator sections, it does not follow that *Hendershot* discloses a structure that meets the features recited in the claims such as that the stator sections are physically shifted relative to one another in a circumferential direction by $360^\circ/n \pm$ an angle related to skew. *Hendershot* discloses two stator sections – not sixteen – that are shifted by 22.5° . *Hendershot* would have to disclose a physical shift of 180° for the two stator sections to be arranged similar to the manner claimed.

It is respectfully submitted that *Nickoladz* cures none of the shortcomings of the previously applied patents, and that, contrary to the arguments in the Official Action, *Hendershot* does not disclose or suggest the claim feature that stator sections are physically

shifted relative to one another in a circumferential direction by $360^\circ/n \pm$ an angle related to skew. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the claims define patentably over the cited references.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims, claims 1-21, are in condition for allowance. Allowance is cordially urged.

If the Examiner should be of the opinion that a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any outstanding issues, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: Oct 9 2003

By: 

Harold R. Brown III
Registration No. 36,341

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620